

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Atty. Dkt. No. 070191-0190 (15-XT-5197)

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 2, 2005 in which claims 1-23 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 14-18, and 21-23 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

I. Examiner Interview Relating to the Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as Anticipated by Miesbauer et al.

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Miesbauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,212,256. With this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 14-18, and 21-23 to overcome the rejection based upon Miesbauer et al.

On January 26, 2006, Applicants' attorney conducted an interview with Examiner Lau regarding the rejection of claims 1-23. The substance of the interview centered around the disclosure of the Miesbauer et al. reference in view of claims 1-23. Agreement was reached during the interview that the Miesbauer et al. reference does not disclose configuring a medical diagnostic system for use with a field replaceable unit in accordance with specified information on the field replaceable unit when the field replaceable unit is a replacement field replaceable unit. However, the Examiner asked that the independent claims be amended to make it clear that the claimed invention relates to the situation where the replacement field replaceable unit is different than the field replaceable unit that is being replaced, therefore requiring a reconfiguration of the medical diagnostic system. The claims have been amended accordingly.

Applicants note that the use of the term "different" in the claims when referring to the replacement field replaceable unit does not limit the scope of the claims to situations where the replacement field replaceable unit is a different model or has different features than the unit that is being replaced. The replacement field replaceable unit may be the same model and type of unit as the one being replaced and still require a reconfiguration (e.g. retuning) of the medical diagnostic system due to minor differences between otherwise identical units

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Atty. Dkt. No. 070191-0190 (15-XT-5197)

(including, e.g., manufacturing inconsistencies). For example, in the context of an x-ray tube, the replacement x-ray tube (field replaceable unit) may have a different focal spot due to manufacturing inconsistencies and therefore require a different applied voltage when used with the medical diagnostic system, even where the x-ray tube is otherwise identical to the one that is being replaced. The claims, as amended, are intended to cover systems and methods that allow for the association of such a "different" replacement field replaceable unit with a medical diagnostic system.

In view of the agreed-upon amendments to claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 14-18, and 21-23, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-23.


II. Conclusion

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11, 14-18, and 21-23 have been amended. Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/10/06
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5897
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By 
Jeffrey S. Gundersen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,619